

H 10528

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 15, 1967

tacked the election to elect delegates to the Constitutional Convention and then attacked the validity of the Constitution itself.

I am certain that the thousands of American boys slugging their way through the treacherous jungles and swamps of South Vietnam want to get this election over with as quickly as possible and start seriously thinking about getting home instead of nit picking every single detail of the election machinery.

The American people want us to get out of Vietnam as quickly as possible and I am certain they will denounce these efforts by a small group of Americans to undermine the validity of the forthcoming election.

The untold problems facing us at home require us to bring this war to a conclusion as quickly as possible. It is my firm conviction that those who would assail the validity of these elections will in fact prolong our involvement in Vietnam.

**PRESIDENT'S VETO AFFORDS
SECOND CHANCE**

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I hope that President Johnson's veto of the Government Employees' Life Insurance bill will be the occasion for action on a fair and responsible bill, which both the House will pass, and the President will sign.

This bill—H.R. 11089—would have added at least \$60 million to the taxpayer's already great burden. At the time the bill passed the House, the full import of our national financial situation was not realized by the Congress, or advanced by the administration. We had not been submitted the prospect of a \$29 billion deficit; we had not been given the proposed increase in social security; we had not been given the bill for a 10 percent surtax increase on private and corporate incomes. With all these evident increases and costs, the President really had no choice, given the implications of this bill. Had the President signed this bill into law, we would have, in effect, added a substantial burden on the taxpayer for a measure which provided its maximum benefits to those members of the Federal Government who need them least. The average employee would have been given a one-third increase in his insurance coverage at the taxpayer's expense. A selected few, including the President and Vice President, the Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officials, and the members of Congress would have received a 100 percent increase in our coverage. I do not think that such an increase could possibly be justified at a time when the expense of Vietnam is steadily increasing our Federal deficit.

I suggest that the Members return to the administration's original proposals for a \$13 million program or something in this area, to improve the system and eliminate some of the obvious inequities of providing additional coverage. This is a bill we could pass, and I would be happy to vote for it.

I recommend, further, that we accept the President's offer to, as he says, explore ways to permit direct purchase by Federal employees from their private funds under current group plans. This is what is commonly done in industry, and I believe that it would be beneficial to Government employees who are quite capable of bearing the small additional cost themselves without asking the taxpayers to do so.

The President has asked the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to begin working immediately with the appropriate committees of Congress toward finding an acceptable and fair insurance system. I would like to assure the members and the committee chairman of my own wholehearted support of their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, it is tough not to vote for all the pay raises possible for Federal and civil service employees. No one wants to cut them back; indeed we all want them to get the best possible pay comparable to private industry. But this cannot always be, particularly in times of a great national deficit. We must be cautious and careful. As much as it hurts to veto a pay measure, the President did what he thought was a sound fiscal approach. I am sure the majority of Congress would now agree—and that we can still find an equitable answer before this session of Congress expires. And, Mr. Speaker, I imagine the President will also be watching other measures of this nature—among other major appropriations—to be certain that we stay within bounds of a reasonable budget, and mainly, at this critical hour, that we cut down on our large deficit.

See NC
AN OPENING IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. STEIGER of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, while American Armed Forces are striving to close a door against the Communist onslaught on South Vietnam, it appears that we have left another door wide open in the Middle East.

In the confusion that has ensued from the recent Arab-Israel war, it is now apparent that the Russians have exploited the situation by establishing naval bases on a de facto premise of allegedly defending the Arabs. Soviet naval craft, including missile cruisers as well as submarines, are now based in the Egyptian ports of Alexandria and Port Said. Soviet military advisers and technicians accompanied the recent massive resupply of Russian weapons to the armed forces of Egypt.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, we learn that the Soviet Union is seeking an airbase in Yemen. This would be the first Russian airbase on territory not contiguous to the Soviet Union or its satellites. Yemen is the strategic land that Egypt's Nasser has sought to dominate in several years of Communist-backed warfare against the Yemeni people.

Russia already is known to have per-

sonnel and equipment at Hudaydah, Yemen. Soviet submarines and torpedo boats are based in Yemen, in a position to control the narrow channel between the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden—in other words, the passage between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean.

A Soviet base in Egyptian-controlled Yemen would control the sea route from Europe to Asia and east Africa even if the Suez Canal is reopened with access available to all nations. The Russians could control not only the sea route from the Mediterranean to the Far East but would be in a position to dominate the Persian Gulf and the oil-rich lands of the Arabian Peninsula.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that instead of telling Egypt's Nasser that he will not get another cent of American aid as long as Russian military personnel are on Egyptian soil or Egyptian-controlled portions of Yemen, American diplomats are currently beseeching Nasser to accept renewed American aid. All Nasser has to do, apparently, is resume diplomatic relations with us.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Department of State for an immediate report on the secret talks now in progress in Cairo. If the American taxpayers are to pay for a new handout, they have a right to know what is being promised. I will certainly oppose any aid to Egypt unless that country takes positive steps to oust the Russians and identify herself with policies consistent with free world interests. This includes a peace settlement with Israel and free access through international waterways for all nations.

Mr. Speaker, I am also asking for another explanation. This one is directed to the Department of Defense. It is even more serious than the first issue raised.

Instead of opposing the takeover in Yemen by pro-Communist forces of Egypt, the administration granted diplomatic recognition to the puppet regime in Sanaa, Yemen. Under our very eyes, the Russians entered Yemen, their submarines docked there, and their aircraft flew in support of Egyptian forces.

Nasserite forces, backed by Moscow, sought to expel the British from nearby Aden. The squeeze was aimed at taking over all the oil of the Arabian Peninsula, including the Arameo interests in Saudi Arabia.

The closure of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israel shipping was a phase of the plan to take over the Arabian Peninsula. Even if the administration had sought to use force in the Straits of Tiran, we did not have the available force in that region.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know why the United States today has no fleet worthy of the name operating in the Red Sea and Indian Ocean. There is a vacuum in the Red Sea, the waters of the Persian Gulf, the wider reaches of the Indian Ocean. Why are we so naked in this vital area? Are the Russians to take over by default?

The closure of the Suez Canal prevents reinforcement from the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. The war in Vietnam prevents reinforcement from the naval elements engaged in that area.

I want the Defense Department to frankly explain why we are so weak in

sive action. Air pollution is hardly new. As early as 61 A.D. Seneca complained of "the heavy air of Rome," caused by the smokey chimneys "with their pestilent vapors and soot."

As industry grew in the United States, environmental pollution inexorably grew with it. As the population went West, environmental pollution went with it. As the number of motor vehicles grew, environmental pollution grew. The process is inevitable.

Perhaps there was no major effort to halt it because the harmful effects of air pollution were once unclear. One could see that the air was dirty; one could smell the poisons in the air. Today the evidence is crystal-clear, the nation now recognizes that air pollution kills.

The hazard to human health is well-known. The functioning of the respiratory system is dependent on clean air. As the exposure to contaminated air increases, the individual breathing capacity is impaired; the amount of oxygen readily available to the blood stream is gradually reduced; and the total health of the individual declines. Then, when other stresses appear—such as the common cold, diseases, heart trouble or aging—the respiratory system has less capability to maintain its function. Health declines further from the strain of trying to make use of dirty air with a physiological system designed only for clean air. Finally, in a great many instances, death is hastened. The certificate may ascribe the cause to any one of a number of specific failures. However, a growing list of competent medical studies show that polluted air is often a significant contributing factor. Many of the gains of medical science are offset by the continued degradation of the air we breathe.

The nation also now recognizes the great economic loss due to air pollution. It has been estimated that, without even counting possible damage to crops, the total loss equals \$11 to \$12 billion per year or about \$65.00 for each man, woman and child in America. In the New York Metropolitan area the loss from pollution is probably \$200 per capita and in Manhattan it may be as high as \$350 per capita. Increased laundering and lighting alone costs \$20 per capita nationally. Moreover, some experts consider even these figures too low, as all the possible damage that air pollution causes is not yet known.

Above all, the nation overwhelmingly rejects the specter, raised by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Gardner, of individual gas masks to be worn in urban areas or "clean air shelters" where those, who are allergic, ill with respiratory diseases or simply very young or very old, could huddle during a pollution alert, breathing specially treated air supplies.

The pending legislation should be examined with the foregoing basic considerations in mind.

All of the major bills proposed this year involve some type of national, regional, or state standards—source emission standards, air quality standards, or a combination of both—in recognition of the fact that polluters will not regulate themselves. The imposition of standards would destroy the argument often espoused by industries that large sums of money for pollution abatement equipment should not be invested without assurances that they will be adequate. Let us make clear what is adequate, and let us do it promptly.

In combating air pollution, the key question is what type of standards, who sets them and how they are to be enforced. If we are to stop the polluters, we must do it firmly by setting a clear level and requiring them to meet it. Let me address myself to these questions.

I believe that both my own bill, H.R. 8467, and the Administration's original proposal take the only adequate approach—nationwide maximum emission standards for in-

dustries which do the most polluting, regional air quality and emission standards, and strong enforcement provisions through the use of court enforceable cease and desist orders.

We must have nation-wide maximum emission standards so that major industries are treated similarly and know just how much they must do in air pollution control.

We must have inter-state regional ambient air quality standards and controls—not state-wide standards—simply because air pollution is not confined to States. In New York City, for instance, much of the air pollution comes from New Jersey. Only a regional commission can solve the regional problem.

Finally, we must have real enforcement by the Federal government because—like taxes, nobody is going to pay to end their own profitable pollution unless they have to.

States have long ago shown they will not set up effective air pollution standards or controls.

The present Federal three-step approach, with conferences and hearings and injunctions, too, has been proven effective.

To begin to end air pollution, the Secretary of HEW must have the power to issue cease-and-desist orders to anyone who violates air quality standards.

These are minimum requirements for effective anti-pollution action.

Under my bill, H.R. 8467, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare would set national emission standards, which would be reviewed each year, for those industries now contributing the greatest amount of pollution to our air. Individual state standards would supersede the national standards if they were equivalent or more stringent and accompanied by an adequate enforcement plan. The Secretary would review state standards every six months to determine if the standards and their enforcement were adequate.

In addition, H.R. 8467 would set up Regional Air Quality Commissions to promulgate regional air quality and pollutant emission standards which would have to be at least as strict as national standards, although in many areas they would probably be stronger.

For violations of either national or regional emission standards, the Secretary would be empowered to issue cease and desist orders.

In my judgment the Senate bill fails to meet the air pollution problem because it does not adopt a true regional approach. Instead, it is a hybrid, the product of understandable compromises, but one which will be inefficient and unduly difficult to enforce. Instead of cutting across state jurisdictions, it insists upon dealing with a multiplicity of state jurisdictions in an attempt to link them together through the designation of air quality control regions and interstate air quality planning agencies.

In addition, the procedure for adopting state standards is long, drawn out, and complicated, permitting the states fifteen months to adopt standards after receiving criteria and recommended control techniques from the Secretary. In all probability, this process would take several years.

Since the next air pollution disaster, which is bound to come, obviously will not be contained by state lines, I disagree with the Senate bill over the question of who shall set ambient air quality standards and how they shall be enforced.

The Regional Air Quality Commission under section 108 of H.R. 8467 would be set up by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare either on the basis of his own surveys or upon the request of the Governors of two or more contiguous states.

A Regional Air Quality Commission would be chaired by an official of the Department

of Health, Education & Welfare, and would include representatives of all the involved states, and would be charged with setting up air quality standards for the region, as well as source emission standards in order to achieve or preserve the requisite air quality. It would consider the concentration of industry, other commercial establishments, population, and the technical and economic feasibility of achieving the desired air quality level. Where national standards exist, a regional commission's standards would have to be either identical or more stringent.

A maze of state standards simply will not meet the problem.

What would happen under the Senate bill when two neighboring states submit different air quality standards?

Air and the poisons in it do not respect state lines. The poisons which enter it in New Jersey drift easily into New York. Therefore, standards are best set regionally by the use of air flow charts.

Of course, air quality standards will be ineffective unless they are translated into enforceable emission standards. As I noted before, the Senate Public Works Committee has recognized this basic truth. But it stops right there. Although there is a Federal veto over states' proposed air quality standards, the Senate provisions give no opportunity for the Federal government to approve or disapprove the emission standards upon which the achievement of ambient air quality standards is contingent. This is a grievous error. We must assure that emission standards are suitable to the air quality level they are designed to produce—and this should not be left to the states. Individual states are faced by pressures which are both natural and yet beyond their ability to resist. Faced with ordinary economic considerations such as the fear of losing business and industry to neighboring states, a state is less likely to set the strict emission standards required by a serious air pollution problem.

Also, experience with the present Clean Air Act shows that state action generally tends to be slow and weak. Only fourteen states have acted on their own to adopt air quality and emission standards. Fewer than 100 local governments have air pollution control programs in operation. In the field of air pollution the states have already had their test—and they have flunked dismally.

H.R. 8467 recommends a two-part approach. First, regional air quality standards and regional source emission standards. Second, in areas where Regional Air Quality Commissions are not set up, national emission standards would prevail for certain industries, which immediately would force them to reduce their pollution to a maximum level.

I would like to point out an important difference in my bill from the Administration's bill in the last two sentences of Section 107(a). My bill provides for frequent review and evaluation by the Secretary—at least once each year—of all national industrial emission standards to determine whether those standards should be changed. I envision a gradual stiffening of national standards as technology improves until industrial pollution has been reduced to safe levels or, hopefully, eliminated.

As our distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) said last December at the National Conference on Air Pollution: "... we need air quality criteria, national ambient air standards, and appropriate emission standards. We must establish these at the national level. Without such guidelines we will not be able to properly control and abate air pollution."

Let me stress the importance of enforcement, for without adequate enforcement,

the vital regions mentioned. The Russians are consolidating bases there, building up power. We are apparently doing nothing.

What will the sacrifices of the Vietnam conflict avail us if communism takes over in the Middle East? The Communists will then dominate the strategic gateway linking Africa and Asia with Europe, the former lifeline of the British Empire. Oil resources required by NATO countries will be controlled by Moscow.

The implications of Russian power will be felt from Morocco to India. Every Moslem land will see Russian strength and American weakness.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Department of Defense to explain why we have no real strength in the Red Sea or Indian Ocean while the Russians are moving in.

NEED FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF METHODS IN EDUCATION AND INSTRUCTION

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I received recently an interesting letter from a presumably shadowy and anonymous person at Indiana University in Bloomington.

DEAR MR. JACOBS: I'm mad! At this moment, I'm sitting among 50 students not listening to a Professor stumble around a chapter on inferential statistics.

There are about 5 math majors in the class. It's Greek to the rest of us. I surmise that most of these persons are elementary teachers, but even those who teach on a secondary level could never in a billion years help any youngster with the information in this course.

As a matter of fact, further education would be a good thing for all of us—but would it be too much to ask them to teach us something relevant to what we are supposed to teach??

These courses, you understand, are required by Indiana State Law.

Concurrently, the Indianapolis Public School System is searching for 150 more teachers for the Fall semester.

Presumably those who are here have jobs, but they have no time to prepare for their teaching assignments because they must memorize inferential statistics.

There are teachers in Indianapolis who are not here, but they are not eligible for teaching positions because:

1. They can't afford (money) to study inferential statistics.

2. Or they can't learn inferential statistics.

3. Or they think the stupidity of it all is not worth the job they seek.

And everybody who knows what the real scoop is keeps still because he doesn't want to lose the degree he needs to get a job.

Neither do I. Don't quote me.

Indignantly yours,

P.S.—No kidding—can't you investigate? And don't go by the Professors. It's their bread and butter.

Mr. Speaker, over a half a century ago Maria Montessori wrote:

Today we hold the pupils in school, restricted by those instruments so degrading to the body and spirit, the desk—and material prizes and punishments. Our aim in all this is to reduce them to the discipline of immobility and science,—to lead them,—where? Far too often toward no definite end.

Often the education of children consists in pouring into their intelligence the intellectual contents of school programmes. And often these programmes have been compiled in the official Department of Education, and their use is imposed by law upon the teacher and the child.

Ah, before such dense and willful disregard of the life which is growing within these children, we should hide our heads in shame and cover our guilty faces with our hands.

Sergi says truly: "today an urgent need imposes itself upon society: the reconstruction of methods in education and instruction, and he who fights for this cause, fights for human regeneration."

Mr. Speaker, the today that Sergi spoke about was more than a half century ago. Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that the more things change the more they remain the same?

AIR POLLUTION

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce opened hearings on proposed legislation to deal with the air pollution menace which threatens all of us. After what I know will be careful consideration of all the testimony, I hope the committee will report out a strong and effective bill.

The problem of air pollution is well known; the Federal Government and the Congress must take all necessary steps to eliminate it.

I include at this point in the RECORD the statement which I made this morning before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 8467, THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967, AUGUST 15, 1967

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you as the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce begins consideration of the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967.

The problems of environmental pollution have long been of great concern to me. I strongly supported passage of the Clean Air Act of 1963 (PL 88-206) and the strengthening amendments contained in the 1965 and 1966 bills (PL 89-272 and PL 89-675). In this Congress I have introduced H.R. 8467 to amend the Clean Air Act and H.R. 9477 to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act. My testimony today will deal with the former although I hope that, before this session concludes, the Committee will hold hearings on H.R. 9477.

Since the House last considered legislation in this area, New York City experienced the Thanksgiving Day inversion of November 24, 1966. In the midst of that emergency I called upon the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to schedule an abatement conference for the New York-New Jersey Metropolitan region.

When the New York-New Jersey Air Pollution Abatement Conference convened on January 3, 1967, I warned:

"Immediate steps must be taken to prevent the pollution disaster which may come tomorrow or the day after to kill thousands of New Yorkers."

I went on to say, "In New York City, our citizens suffer what may be the most polluted air in America."

Last Friday, August 4, 1967, Dr. John T. Middleton, Director of the Public Health Services' National Center for Air Pollution Control released a study confirming my charge and showing that New York indeed has the most polluted air. In a comparison of the air pollution problem among the sixty-five largest metropolitan areas in the country, the New York Metropolitan Area ranked first, followed by Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles and Cleveland.

The report stated, "But in all the large urban areas covered in our report the public health and welfare are threatened by air pollution."

Air pollution is a national problem made up of many regional problems. For instance, in the New York-New Jersey area many local jurisdictions pollute each other. The problem is interstate in nature. The need for effective federal action is clear. State and local governments have failed to cope with it.

Last December 30th I observed at first hand from a helicopter the major sources of pollution in the New York metropolitan area. As I said in reporting—with words and photographs—to the January 3rd Abatement Conference.

"You could see the pollutants pouring out of smoke-stacks, incinerators, powerplants, petrochemical plants, open burning. A pall of smoke was hanging everywhere, and particularly enveloped Manhattan."

"In New York City we saw the pollution pouring out of the city's own incinerators overloaded and unregulated. We saw it coming out of Con Ed's eleven huge plants—the major sulfur dioxide polluters. We saw smoke coming up—strange as it may seem—from open burning in the harbor by the Army Corps of Engineers."

"We saw the pollutants pouring out of Jersey, and beginning their usual drift toward New York."

It was this cesspool in the sky that made last Thanksgiving's weather situation so dangerous. Because of an air inversion poisons in the air were trapped, and the lives of 15 million people caught in this perilous air mass were endangered. Only the fact that it was a holiday weekend—with businesses shut down and less commuter traffic pouring into the City—prevented a major catastrophe.

Of course, these episodes are not peculiar to New York. During the London smog of 1952, 4,000 more deaths occurred in that city than would normally have happened during a similar period of time. In Donora, Pennsylvania, a comparatively small industrial town which in 1948 normally recorded about one death every three days, seventeen people died in a single 24-hour period during a four day smog. We will never know of all the grievous effects of last Thanksgiving Day's inversion.

Although it is now confirmed that air pollution is most severe in the New York area, the problem is not New York's alone, nor is it even an urban problem alone. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has estimated that 60% of all Americans live in areas of persistent air pollution. In Florida, Connecticut, and other areas, agricultural products have been seriously damaged by the poisons in the air. The problem is now critical in all areas—urban and rural—throughout our nation.

Recognizing the danger, our constituents are asking for immediate and meaningful federal action to deal with air pollution. Thus, a Harris Poll has found that there is more public support for expanded federal pollution control than for any other single domestic program. Every housewife who must clean and wash clothes more frequently, every homeowner who must paint more frequently, every citizen who sees his area enshrouded in a black mass of poisons cries out for action.

To the thoughtful citizen, it must be surprising that we have not already taken mas-

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. James D. Foy, Asbury Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for our national heritage of freedom, justice, and equality. May we, of this generation and day, so live, and serve that the high ideals and noble principles upon which our Nation was founded shall become a living reality for all who live in this land of liberty. Touch and raise up, O Lord, in the Legislative Halls of our homeland, a glorious company of apostles of truth, justice, and equity. Give Thy servants the prophet's scorn of tyranny, and a Christlike tenderness for the downtrodden and heavy laden. Grant us the vision, the integrity of soul, and the strength of will which enable men to place the welfare of others and the security of their country above selfish ambition. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arlington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 95. An act for the relief of Capt. Rey D. Baldwin.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon, and in making that request may I state, Mr. Speaker, that this has been cleared with the minority side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, more than 100 years ago Henry David Thoreau wrote, and I quote:

Let every man make known what kind of government would command his respect, and that will be one step toward obtaining it.

In recent weeks, your Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has been making every effort to get representatives of nationally known professional and civic organizations to come forward with their ideas for a code of standards for the conduct of Members of the House and House employees. The response has been disappointing.

Fortunately, the response has not been all negative. A few such organizations have accepted our invitations to offer testimony, and the committee believes it has some meritorious witnesses scheduled for open hearings August 16 and 17. The committee invites all Members of Congress to hear them.

My real purpose in addressing you, however, is to alert the membership to hearings which the committee has scheduled for August 23 and 24 to receive testimony and statements from Members of the House. A letter of invitation has gone out to each Member. I respectfully ask Members to let me or the committee staff know of their desires in this connection.

Further, I should like to assure this body that the committee is moving with all reasonable speed. It has met at least once a week since it was constituted, with the exception of the week of the Fourth of July recess, and is determined to have its recommendations ready for the House later this session.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the District of Columbia may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I hope I shall not have to object, I presume that this has been cleared with the minority side?

Mr. SISK. I have cleared this with the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. HALL. And he is the ranking minority member?

Mr. SISK. That is right.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS OF COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANK SUPERVISION AND INSURANCE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today, August 15, and also August 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman amend his unanimous-consent request so that we do not yield, depending the calendar on this, in advance of today? I have no objection, because I know the distinguished majority leader—

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for permission to sit after today. I limit the request to today only.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman, and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ALLEGED ATROCITIES BY ISRAEL

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

H10500

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 15, 19

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it has been reported that the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in its newsletter accused Jews of committing atrocities against the Arabs. The attack reportedly utilizes a blurred photograph and alleges that the photograph represents Arabs lined up by Zionists and shot in cold blood.

A cartoon in the newsletter reportedly depicts Defense Minister Dayan with dollar signs on his shoulders. Other vicious anti-Semitic cartoons were also reportedly published.

The newsletter reportedly charged that Israel segregates Arabs within Israel; that dark-skinned Jews from the Middle East are discriminated against in Israel and that Israel is an illegal state.

Our State Department has indicated that there have been no massacres; that, on the contrary, there have been attacks against peaceful Israel citizens by Arab infiltrators; that Israel actions during the recent hostilities resulted in the loss of few Arab civilian lives; that the Arab population of Israel has freedom of movement; that Arabs may join primarily Jewish organizations, such as the Histadrut Labor Federation; and that the SNCC statement is not focused on recent events but drags its misrepresentations back to the period before Israel attained independence.

It is clear that SNCC has adopted the pro-Arab Soviet lines in making this anti-Semitic attack.

Soviet anti-Semitism needs no documentation. Reports of its recent resurgence are overwhelming. In this connection, it is noteworthy to point up the coincidence of the presence of Stokely Carmichael, the past chairman of SNCC, in Communist Cuba just prior to the publication of this anti-Semitic tome by SNCC.

Mr. Speaker, this article is nothing more than an attempt to apply the blame for the problems facing the Negro to the shoulders of the Jewish people. Thus, the civil rights movement is compromised and the Jewish people are blamed for the conditions that so many of them have sought to alleviate.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, there were two typographical errors in my speech on my proposed amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, daily edition, August 10, 1967, on page H10356.

In line 14 from the top of the third column of page H10356, "section 203(d)" should read "section 203(c)".

In line 32 from the top of the third column of page H10356, "8 U.S.C. 1115 (b)" should read "8 U.S.C. 1151(b)".

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

PATRIOTIC DEMONSTRATIONS IN SUPPORT OF OUR WAR EFFORT

(Mr. ROUDEBUSH asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, in time of war the paramount aim of our Government should be total, unmistakable, and demonstrative support for the American fighting man in the field.

I regret to report to the Congress today that I have tragic proof that our soldiers, sailors, and airmen are not receiving this support.

And, furthermore, the war policy of this Government is concerned with the political considerations rather than unqualified concern for the morale of our men in the field.

I have obtained a copy of a Navy order to all naval district commanders ordering them to refuse participation in patriotic demonstrations in support of our troops in Vietnam.

This is an incredible document and I wish the Members of Congress to hear the pertinent section of this order, which follows:

The recent anti-Vietnam policy demonstrations conducted throughout the country have produced reactions by veterans and patriotic groups in several areas. Rallies and parades are being staged by these organizations for the specific purpose of off-setting the peace rallies. Navy participation, such as speakers, bands and marching units, has been requested in a number of instances and can be expected to be requested in any future counter-demonstrations organized by these well-meaning groups. In view of the political implications of this particular category of demonstrations, Navy support would be inappropriate.

I hope very much that immediate consideration be taken to rescind this order. I think that refusal of naval groups from participating in parades held by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and other veterans groups is not in the best interest of this Nation.

WORLDWIDE FACILITIES FOR SPREAD OF ANARCHY?

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President submitted to the Congress a world communications message placing upon the Great Society the responsibility to provide, not a chicken in every pot, or a car in every garage, but rather a television set in every home from the darkest regions of the Congo to the barren wastes of the Antarctic.

This latest message seems incongruous in view of the President's request for a tax increase. I recall he asked Congress not to spend more money while the executive branch is trying so hard to cut expenses.

I cannot help but wonder what kind of programming will go out over the new global communications system—Intelsat—referred to in the President's message. The Rap Browns and the Stokely Carmichaels have been exposed to millions of TV viewers in our own country with their message of hate and insurrection. Does the President believe it would be a public service to provide them with worldwide facilities to preach their brand of anarchy?

PRESS ATTACKS UPON THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. CAHILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have always hesitated to criticize the press of this country, recognizing that if one is in politics, one usually cannot win. But I see each year more irresponsibility evidenced in the press of our country. I think that when there is an attack made upon the Congress of the United States, it is up to us to refute it and to have something to say about it.

I have asked for this time to comment upon a statement in an editorial in the Washington Post this morning in relation to the anticerime bill. I recognize that the Post has differing views than I do as far as the bill, and that is perfectly proper. I recognize their right to disagree with what I think is right and what the House thinks is right. I recognize they have a right to comment as vigorously as possible, but when they make irresponsible statements I think it is about time for Members of the House to take issue with the Washington Post and any other newspaper that might make similar statements. The statement is this:

Underlying the action of the House was a feeling that its Members are afraid of Attorney General Clark, afraid that if he has control of the funds, he will force local police forces to obey the Constitution in fighting crime.

I believe inherent in that statement are two grave misconceptions. One is that local police forces are, in fact, violating the Constitution; and, second, that the Congress of the United States not only approves the violation of the Constitution by local police forces but refused to pass the crime bill as it was put before the House by the administration because we do not want the Constitution enforced.

I can only say that whoever wrote this editorial wrote it as a result of a complete lack of knowledge of what was in the crime bill and what was in the amendment, or with a direct intent to harm the prestige and image and character of the Congress of the United States.

An overwhelming majority of the House of both parties supported the legislation.

The Post has done a disservice to the House in suggesting such base and unfounded motivations.

MY PROFLIGATE UNCLE

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have received, and would like to share with the House, a poignant letter from a young constituent who presents an unusual personal problem for my consideration. I should like to ask the advice and assistance of the House in dealing with this matter.